



**Georgia Professional
Standards Commission**

**Guidance and
Implementation Plans for
Educator Preparation Rule
505-3-.01**

**Version 2
April 2013**

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	3
	Rule 505-3-.01 Task Force and Contributing Authors	4
	Purpose and Intended Uses.....	6
	Accessing Revised Versions and Other Resources.....	6
II.	New Terminology	7
III.	Guidance and Implementation Timelines/Phases for Rule Changes or Additions:	
	A. GaPSC Approval Requirements, Procedures, and Commission Actions	
	1. Approval Prior to Program Start.....	8
	2. Approval Review Process Start Prior to Governing Board Approval	11
	3. GaPSC Decision Options and Consequences for Rule/Policy Violations	12
	4. Out-of-State Program Provider Requirements.....	13
	B. Ethics	
	5. Georgia Code of Ethics for Educators (teaching and assessing in programs)	16
	C. Clinical Practice, Field Experiences, and Partnerships	19
	6. Clinical Practice Requirements	19
	7. Field Experiences (new definition)	20
	8. Field Experience Requirements for Birth Through Kindergarten Programs.....	23
	9. P-12 Partnerships (new definition).....	25
	D. National Standards	
	10. Converting from the GA Framework for Teaching to the InTASC Standards	28
	11. Preparing Teacher Candidates to Teach any State-Mandated Curriculum (CCGPS).....	29
	E. Recommending for Certification Five or More Years after Completion	31
	F. Technology	
	13. Preparing Teacher Candidates to Teach in a Distance Learning Environment	32
	14. Use of Technology in Field and Clinical Experiences	32
	G. Testing	
	15. Readiness for State Content Assessment (GACE).....	33
IV.	Notifying the GaPSC of Substantive Changes Resulting from Rule Changes	36
V.	Appendices:	
	A. Links to Rule 505-3-.01 and the Georgia Code of Ethics for Educators	37
	B. Quick Reference Guide – Summary of Implementation Dates	38
	C. GaPSC Approval Decision Options.....	39
	D. Template for Substantive Change Report.....	47
	E. Link to NCATE Standards for Professional Development Schools.....	49
NEW	F. Summary of Version Updates.....	50

I. Introduction

Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GaPSC) Educator Preparation Rule 505-3-.01 *REQUIREMENTS AND STANDARDS FOR APPROVING PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNITS AND EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS* establishes the requirements and standards for all entities and programs that prepare educators for Georgia educator certification. The revised rule, effective January 15, 2013, includes a number of significant changes and additions impacting the design and operation of all GaPSC-approved program providers and educator preparation programs. Changes can be broadly categorized as follows:

- GaPSC Approval Requirements, Procedures, and Commission Actions
- Ethics
- Birth-12 Partnerships and Field and Clinical Experiences
- National Standards
- Recommendation for Certification
- Technology
- Testing

The amended rule reflects an emphasis on stronger partnerships among program providers and local schools, aimed at creating reciprocal relationships whereby educators are prepared for their roles in more authentic ways through practical and rigorous field and clinical experiences. In this clinical approach to educator preparation, pre-service educators learn to teach or lead in real and authentic settings under the guidance of seasoned educators; practicing educators benefit from frequent collaboration and professional learning opportunities with program provider faculty; and schools have a more substantial role in preparing their future workforce. Rule 505-3-.01 also requires a stronger emphasis on teaching and assessing knowledge and attitudes related to educator ethics, sets expectations for preparing educators to teach in a distance learning environment, and requires program providers to incorporate in their programs the InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards published in 2011 by the Council of Chief State School Officers. InTASC standards set high expectations for the preparation of teachers, shifting the focus of preparation to the learner and the actions of the teacher which most positively impact learning. These 2011 standards are nationally recognized as representative of the most currently accepted best practices in teaching and learning. It is anticipated that the changes included in the 2013 amendment of Rule 505-3-.01 will significantly improve the preparation of educators and eventually result in not only more synergistic relationships among all B-20 educators in Georgia but also in improved student achievement.

Rule 505-3-.01 Task Force and Contributing Authors

GaPSC Educator Preparation staff wish to recognize and thank the individuals listed below for their service on the task force and committees responsible for recommending amendments to Rule 505-3-.01 and for developing supporting documents aimed at assisting program providers as they implement rule changes. The core members of the task force began working to develop rule changes in November 2010. The task force was expanded in the summer of 2012 to include three committees and an advisory group. All but three members of the original task force have continued to serve through 2012 and into 2013, lending their time and expertise on one or more of the committees charged with developing guidance documents, implementation plans, or supporting documents. Members of the Guidance Committee and the Implementation Plan Committee developed the majority of the content found in this document. Georgia Framework for Teaching Committee and Advisory Group members are developing the *Georgia Model Teaching Progressions*, a tool aimed at supporting the implementation of the InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards in preparation programs and P-12 schools.

We are extremely grateful for the dedication and excellent work of each person listed below. Each played an important role in helping us revise the rule and create accompanying documents which we believe will improve the preparation of educators in our state and ultimately lead to improvements in teaching and learning.

Core Task Force Members:

Dr. Ruth Caillouet, Clayton State University
Dr. Judy Carter, Fort Valley State University
Dr. Angela Coleman, University System of Georgia
Dr. Bob Cummings, Piedmont College
Dr. Debbie Gober, Columbus State University
Dr. Susan Malone, Mercer University
Dr. Kim Metcalf, University of West Georgia
Dr. Bob Michael, University of North Georgia
Dr. Linda Noble, University System of Georgia
Dr. Deborah Thomas, Georgia Southern University
Dr. Steven Thomas, Formerly of Paine College
Dr. Judi Wilson, Georgia Regents University

Guidance Committee Members:

Dr. Ruth Caillouet, Clayton State University
Dr. Maryellen Cosgrove, Gainesville State College
Dr. Donna Gardner, Toccoa Falls College
Dr. Kim Metcalf, University of West Georgia
Ms. Nikki Mouton, Gwinnett County Public Schools

Implementation Plan Committee Members:

Dr. Judy Carter, Fort Valley State University
Dr. Angela Coleman, University System of Georgia
Ms. Beth Johnston, North Georgia RESA
Dr. Susan Malone, Mercer University
Dr. Leigh Ann Putman, Metropolitan RESA
Dr. Deborah Thomas, Georgia Southern University
Dr. Judi Wilson, Georgia Regents University

Georgia Framework for Teaching Committee Members:

Dr. Angela Coleman, University System of Georgia
Dr. Angie Gant, Truett-McConnell College
Dr. Debbie Gober, Columbus State University
Ms. Susan Jacobs, Georgia Department of Education
Ms. Carlene Kirkpatrick, Georgia Department of Education
Dr. Ann Levett, Middle Georgia State College
Ms. Qualyn McIntyre, Atlanta Public Schools
Dr. Janice McLeroy, Northeast Georgia RESA
Ms. Kathie Monti, Georgia Department of Education
Ms. Rhonda Powers, Okefenokee RESA

Georgia Framework for Teaching Advisory Group Members:

Mr. Sandy Addis, Pioneer RESA
Dr. Deborah Bembry, Albany State University
Mr. Ron Bryant, Heart of Georgia RESA
Dr. Cindi Chance, Georgia Regents University
Dr. Arlinda Eaton, Kennesaw State University
Ms. Karen Faircloth, Northwest Georgia RESA
Ms. Laura Frizzell, Coastal Plains RESA
Dr. Judy Godfrey, Bibb County Schools
Dr. Sandy Leslie, Brenau University
Dr. Don Livingston, LaGrange College
Dr. Joyce Many, Georgia State University
Dr. Jim Marshall, University of Georgia
Ms. Iris Mathis, Lowndes County Schools
Ms. Diane Ray, PAGE
Dr. Melissa Roland, Chattahoochee-Flint RESA
Ms. Sandra Schwellinger, GAE
Dr. Andrew Smith, Cobb County Schools
Ms. Robin Smith, Middle Georgia RESA
Ms. Rachel Spates, West Georgia RESA
Dr. Sean Warner, Clark Atlanta University
Dr. Jeffrey Wilson, White County Schools
Ms. Kelly Young, Southwest Georgia RESA

GaPSC staff members contributing to the work of the Task Force and the development of this document include:

Dr. Bobbi Ford
Dr. David M. Hill
Ms. Penney McRoy
Ms. Phyllis S. Payne
Ms. Anne Marie Fenton
Dr. Chuck McCampbell

Purpose and Intended Uses

This document was developed jointly by GaPSC staff members and representatives of Georgia program providers as a means of assisting all providers in:

- interpreting new terms and the language of the rule,
- understanding the implications of rule changes/additions as they relate to program design and delivery, and
- planning for implementation of immediate and long-term procedural and programmatic changes.

Sections of this document address each substantial rule change or addition, and each section includes:

- rule references,
- relevant definitions,
- implementation timelines,
- if applicable, suggested phases of implementation, and
- guidance for interpreting the rule change or new requirement.

Program providers are encouraged to consider this document an important guide for understanding GaPSC expectations, and for planning and implementing rule changes impacting all preparation programs. Implementation timelines should be considered required; for instance, some changes take effect immediately, while others may be phased in over time. The implementation timelines indicate when GaPSC staff will expect full implementation and when BOE teams will expect to find evidence of implementation (see Appendix A: Quick Reference Guide—Summary of Implementation Dates). Guidance related to program design and delivery is not intended to be mandatory; however, variances should be justifiable.

Accessing Revised Versions

Rule 505-3-.01 Guidance Documents and other resources may be accessed from the GaPSC website pages dedicated to providing resources for program providers. The resource pages are located at <http://www.gapsc.com/EducatorPreparation/Resources/Home.aspx>. Expand the Resources menu on the left margin navigation pane to select the appropriate program provider type. Document footers will indicate the latest revision date.

II. New Terminology

Rule 505-3-.01 contains a glossary of over twenty terms used throughout the rule and in other related documents. Of the definitions provided in the rule, five are worthy of additional explanation. Three are included here; the new definitions of field experiences and partnerships are addressed in the guidance section of this document.

1. *Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP): The national accreditation organization formed as a result of the unification of NCATE (see definition (o)) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC). CAEP is an association governed by the education profession and by others who have a stake in the outcomes of professional educator preparation programs. Upon completion of the unification process, CAEP will be recognized as the single, national accreditor of education program providers.*

As an NCATE partner state, Georgia will develop a partnership with CAEP and transition, over time, to all applicable CAEP standards, approval review procedures, and policies. Although all Georgia program providers are not required to seek and maintain national accreditation, the GaPSC will continue its current practice of applying the same standards to all program providers. As Rule 505-3-.01 was being revised, the transition from NCATE to CAEP was not yet complete; therefore, the rule contains references to both NCATE and CAEP. In future revisions of the rule adjustments will be made to reflect the current status of Georgia's partnership with the national accreditor.

2. *Education Program Provider(EPP): The institution of higher education (IHE), college, school, department, agency, or other administrative body with the responsibility for managing or coordinating all programs offered for the initial and continuing preparation of teachers and other school personnel, regardless of where these programs are administratively housed (formerly referred to as the professional education unit).*

The term *Education Program Provider (EPP)* emerged as NCATE began the transition to form CAEP. It is intended to be more inclusive of various types of program providers. As we have several types of program providers in Georgia (non-profit organizations/associations, local education agencies, RESAs, and institutions), we decided to adopt this change of terminology and incorporate the new term in Rule 505-3-.01. You will see the term *education program provider, or the acronym EPP*, used in place of the term *professional education unit, or unit*, throughout the rule and this document.

3. Other potentially unfamiliar terms you will notice in this document are *B-12 or B-20*, used in place of P-12 or P-20. We replaced Pre-school (P) with Birth (B), to recognize and include in our range of partners, educators and providers serving children from birth through age 5.

III. Guidance and Implementation Timelines/Phases for Rule Changes or Additions

A. GaPSC Approval Requirements, Procedures, and Commission Actions

1. Approval Prior to Program Start

Rule Statements and References

The education program provider must be approved by the GaPSC before candidates are formally admitted to educator preparation programs. Rule 505-3-.01, paragraph (3) (c) 5.

Educator preparation programs shall be approved by the GaPSC before candidates are admitted and begin program coursework. Rule 505-3-.01, paragraph (3) (e) 1.

Implementation

(1) Timeline:

Full implementation is expected immediately, as of the rule effective date of January 15, 2013, for all program providers.

(2) Definition:

Full implementation means starting January 15, 2013, program providers must seek and gain GaPSC approval of the education program provider and/or preparation programs before candidates are formally admitted to and begin taking courses in educator preparation programs. Prospective candidates may submit applications for program admission and institutions may process those applications prior to program approval.

Guidance

Updated Rule 505-3-.01 stipulates that no program may admit candidates until both the EPP and the program have been granted at least Developmental Approval. While this was implicit in the past, it is made explicit in the updated Rule.

(1) What/who is the EPP?

According to Rule 505-3-.01, the Education Program Provider is defined as, “The institution, college, school, department, agency, or other administrative body with the responsibility for managing or coordinating all programs offered for the initial and continuing preparation of teachers and other school personnel, regardless of where these programs are administratively housed.”

(2) What is Developmental Approval?

As per Decision Options adopted by the PSC in July, 2012, Developmental Approval indicates that a new Education Program Provider and/or proposed educator preparation programs have been deemed by the PSC to meet all or most of the eight

Georgia Standards. Developmental Review/Approval is the first step in the longer term process of securing and maintaining Continuing Approval.

(3) What does the term “approval” mean in this context?

For new Education Program Providers or programs, the results of the Developmental Review process can be of three types.

- i. Developmental Approval indicates that the program or EPP has met all eight Georgia Standards, although areas for improvement may be identified. Programs or EPPs being granted Developmental Approval may begin admitting candidates and offering the program, and they are next subject to Initial Performance Review within three years.
- ii. Provisional Approval indicates that the program or EPP has failed to meet one or more of the eight Georgia Standards. Programs or EPPs being granted Provisional Approval may begin admitting candidates and offering the program, but they will be required to satisfy particular provisions within a specified period of time.
- iii. Denial of Approval indicates that the program or EPP “does not meet one or more of the Georgia Standards and has pervasive problems.” Programs being denied approval may not begin admitting candidates or offering programs.

Program or EPP approval status is not official until the Commission formally votes on the approval action. As a result, no program may admit candidates until the program and/or EPP have been approved formally by Commission vote.

(4) What does “program start” mean?

By this rule, the start of a new program (or EPP’s operation) is defined as the point at which candidates are admitted to the program (or EPP) requesting approval. Updated Rule 505-3-.01 prohibits programs or EPPs from admitting candidates (i.e., “starting”) until Developmental Approval has been granted.

(5) When/at what point do candidates apply?

Prospective candidates may apply to the new program or EPP during the period when approval is under consideration and before the program or EPP is formally granted Developmental Approval. However, no candidate may be granted admission to the new program or EPP until formal approval is granted. In such cases, applying candidates should be carefully and clearly made aware that the program to which they are applying has not yet been approved by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission, and they will not be admitted until such approval is obtained.

(6) When should the planning process for Developmental Review begin?

- i. Prior to revision of Rule 505-3-.01, the process of Developmental Review began one year (two semesters) prior to the semester during which the program or EPP intended to begin. However, the revised rule requires that the process begin at least two years (four academic semesters) prior to the anticipated program or EPP start date. The process is initiated by submission of the Intent to Seek Approval form (available at [GaPSC - Resources for program providers www.gapsc.com/EducatorPreparation/Resources/Home.aspx](http://www.gapsc.com/EducatorPreparation/Resources/Home.aspx)).

- ii. Thorough preparation during this phase of process is critical to the success of the Review and of the future of the program and/or EPP. During this phase, several factors must be considered and their solutions addressed. Among these are:
 - a) What budget will be necessary to support the program/EPP's operation and how will these resources be ensured?
 - b) How will faculty for the program be provided? Will existing faculty members be reassigned to the program, or will additional/new faculty members be required? If existing faculty will be reassigned, how will their former responsibilities be addressed?
 - c) Is the program/EPP viewed by all stakeholders as valid and rigorous? Were B-12 and other partners engaged in the development of the program/EPP and are their perspectives clearly reflected? Have members of the professional education community reviewed the proposed program and has their feedback been addressed?
 - d) Has buy-in from higher level administrators been established for the program/EPP? Do they clearly understand the need for the program, the structure and functioning of the program, and how the program/EPP contributes to the larger goals and mission of the organization? Have they formally committed to provide the resources that will be required to effectively offer the program?

(7) What is the approval process timeline?

The approval process for Developmental Review of a new EPP is a two year process which starts with the provider submitting an Intent to Seek Approval Form (ISA). Once the GaPSC receives the ISA an Education Specialist (ES) is assigned to the provider. The ES works closely with the provider to develop a timeline for submitting all the required documents and reports such as the Preconditions Report which is due three semesters before the visit; the Program Reports which are due one year prior to the visit; and the Institution Report and Exhibit Room which are due a minimum of two months before the visit.

2. Approval Review Process Start Prior to Governing Board Approval

Rule Statements and References

An education institution or agency's education program provider (e.g. college/school/department of education), and/or program(s) shall be approved by its governing board prior to seeking GaPSC approval for the first time (Developmental Approval). Rule 505-3-.01, paragraph (3) (c) 1.

A GaPSC-approved education program provider seeking approval to add new preparation programs may submit the programs for GaPSC approval prior to receiving governing board approval, as long as governing board approval is granted thirty (30) days prior to the scheduled pre-visit. Rule 505-3-.01, paragraph (3) (d) 2.

Implementation

- (1) Timeline:
Full implementation is expected immediately, as of the rule effective date of January 15, 2013, for all program providers.
- (2) Definition:
Full implementation means starting January 15, 2013, program providers may submit the Intent to Seek Approval Form and begin the GaPSC approval review process prior to receiving formal approval by the governing board (i.e. USG Board of Regents, LEA School Board, RESA Board of Control, etc.). Preparations for the GaPSC approval review process, to include the submission of program reports (PRS) may continue as long as a letter indicating formal governing board approval is received thirty (30) days prior to the scheduled Pre-visit. The Pre-visit typically occurs 45 to 60 days prior to the on-site or electronic approval review.

Guidance

Until this amendment, Rule 505-3-.01 required approval by the EPP's appropriate governing board prior to initiating the Developmental Review Process, indicating, "An education agency's degree(s), Education Program Provider, and/or program(s) shall be approved by its governing board prior to seeking Professional Standards Commission Approval." However, the updated rule allows program providers to begin the Developmental Review Process for a new program prior to formal approval by the governing board.

- (1) Can the Intent to Seek Approval form be submitted before a letter is available indicating the EPP's governing board has approved the program? Yes.
- (2) What can be done prior to securing governing board approval?

Several specific tasks can be completed while governing board approval is in process. For example:

- i. The tentative dates for on-site review may be established.
- ii. Program/EPP budgets can be prepared.

- iii. The program report or reports may be developed (PRS) by the EPP.
 - iv. Evidence necessary to support the review of the program can be compiled and organized.
 - v. The Board of Examiners team may be established and members confirmed.
- (3) What must be submitted to GaPSC regarding governing board approval?
- i. A letter documenting governing body approval must be submitted to the GaPSC at least 30 days prior to the pre-visit. This pre-visit is typically scheduled at least 45 days prior to the on-site review.
 - ii. It is recommended that each program provider work closely and directly with its Education Specialist at the outset of this program development and approval process to establish an appropriate timeline and to identify necessary governing board approvals to be submitted to the GaPSC.

3. GaPSC Decision Options and Consequences for Rule/Policy Violations

Rule Statements and References

Education agencies seeking GaPSC approval as an education program provider shall follow all applicable GaPSC policies and procedures, e.g., preconditions to determine eligibility for a review, approval review requirements, cost guidelines, post review requirements, Commission decisions, public disclosure policy, and annual reporting procedures. Out-of-state institutions accredited by NCATE or CAEP and approved by the GaPSC to recommend program completers for Georgia certification in the field of Educational Leadership must maintain National Recognition status by the NCATE or CAEP-accepted Specialized Professional Association for Educational Leadership programs for the Educational Leadership program(s) offered to Georgia educators and shall follow all applicable GaPSC policies, including, but not limited to, those regarding preparation program effectiveness measures, annual reporting and data submission requirements. In order to maintain approval status, all GaPSC-approved professional education units (including out-of-state providers offering GaPSC-approved Educational Leadership programs) must comply with all applicable GaPSC rules and policies. Failure by an approved provider to fully comply with GaPSC Educator Preparation, Certification, and Ethics Rules, Commission approval decisions, or agency procedures and/or requirements may result in changes in approval status that could include revocation of approval. Failure to comply with federal reporting requirements may result in fines. Rule 505-3-.01, paragraph (3) (c) 4.

Each education program provider approved to offer educator preparation programs shall comply with all reporting requirements, to include the submission of data related to preparation program effectiveness measures and data required in GaPSC and federal annual reports on the performance of the program provider and all educator preparation programs. Rule 505-3-.01, paragraph (3) (c) 7.

GaPSC-approved education program providers seeking approval for preparation programs leading to Georgia educator certification shall follow all applicable GaPSC program approval policies and procedures in effect at the time of the requested approval. Rule 505-3-.01, paragraph (3) (d) 3.

Implementation

- (1) **Timeline:**
GaPSC Approval Decision Options were adopted by the Commission July 12, 2012, and became effective September 1, 2012.
- (2) **Definitions:**
 - i. *Approval* is defined in Rule 505-3-.01 as a process for assessing and enhancing academic and education quality through peer review, to assure the public that an education program provider and/or program has met institutional, state, and national standards of educational quality; also, a Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GaPSC) decision rendered when an education program provider or program meets GaPSC standards.
 - ii. Members of the Georgia Professional Standards Commission Educator Preparation and Certification Committee, when reviewing approval or related requests have a set of options from which to choose in rendering decisions. These *Approval decision options* are in three categories: approval reviews, progress reports, changes in national accreditation status and/or failure to meet standards, and non-compliance with rules, commission decisions, or procedures.

Guidance

Program providers are strongly encouraged to become familiar with the *GaPSC Approval Decision Options* document included in Appendix D. The document describes all the decision options from which Commissioners can choose when rendering an approval decision; the consequences for late reporting or failure to submit required reports; Commission actions resulting from changes in national accreditation status or failure to meet standards; and consequences for non-compliance with agency regulations, decisions, or procedures. EPPs should also avail themselves of every opportunity to learn about GaPSC reporting requirements (webinars, meetings, workshops, etc.), and to carefully document and monitor reporting due dates and Commission decision requirements such as Progress Reports. The Program Approval Education Specialist assigned to each program provider is the recommended first point of contact for information related to agency regulations, Commission decisions, and unless otherwise indicated, for reporting requirements.

4. Out-of-state program provider requirements (for Ed Leadership only)

Rule Statements and References

NCATE or CAEP accreditation of an education program provider shall be accepted as a route to GaPSC approval of an education program provider administratively based in the state of Georgia. In order to recommend program completers for Georgia certification in the field of Educational Leadership, out-of-state institutions operating in Georgia must be accredited by NCATE or CAEP and meet all other requirements specified by GaPSC. Rule 505-3-.01, paragraph (3) (c) 3.

Education agencies seeking GaPSC approval as an education program provider shall follow all applicable GaPSC policies and procedures, e.g., preconditions to determine eligibility for a review, approval review requirements, cost guidelines, post review requirements, Commission decisions, public disclosure policy, and annual reporting procedures. Out-of-state institutions accredited by NCATE or CAEP and approved by the GaPSC to recommend program completers for Georgia certification in the field of Educational Leadership must maintain National Recognition status by the NCATE or CAEP-accepted Specialized Professional Association for Educational Leadership programs for the Educational Leadership program(s) offered to Georgia educators and shall follow all applicable GaPSC policies, including, but not limited to, those regarding preparation program effectiveness measures, annual reporting and data submission requirements. In order to maintain approval status, all GaPSC-approved education program providers (including out-of-state providers offering GaPSC-approved Educational Leadership programs) must comply with all applicable GaPSC rules and policies. Failure by an approved provider to fully comply with GaPSC Educator Preparation, Certification, and Ethics Rules, Commission approval decisions, or agency procedures and/or requirements may result in changes in approval status that could include revocation of approval. Failure to comply with federal reporting requirements may result in fines. Rule 505-3-.01, paragraph (3) (c) 4.

Out-of-State NCATE or CAEP-accredited education program providers seeking GaPSC approval to offer programs leading to Georgia certification in the field of Educational Leadership must gain and maintain National Recognition for each program (and at each applicable program/degree level) through the appropriate NCATE or CAEP-accepted Specialized Professional Association (SPA) (currently ELCC) and must comply with all GaPSC program approval policies and procedures in effect at the time of the requested approval. Educational Leadership programs offered by out-of-state institutions that do not receive and maintain National Recognition by the appropriate NCATE or CAEP-accepted SPA are not eligible for GaPSC program approval and therefore completers will not be eligible for Georgia Educational Leadership certification. Rule 505-3-.01, paragraph (3) (d) 5.

Implementation

- (1) Timeline:
Full implementation is expected immediately, as of the rule effective date of January 15, 2013, for all out-of-state program providers.
- (2) Definition:
Full implementation means starting January 15, 2013, out-of-state program providers must meet all applicable requirements specified in Rule 505-3-.01, as well as the applicable elements of the Georgia Standards (2008).

Guidance

Particular conditions apply to out-of-state institutions which intend to offer programs leading to Georgia certification in the field of Educational Leadership.

- (1) All institutions must hold appropriate regional accreditation and NCATE/CAEP accreditation at the time of submission of the GAPSC Intent to Seek Approval Form. Such accreditation must be verified in writing and copies of accreditation letters from the appropriate agencies must be attached to the form upon submission.
- (2) All programs must gain National Recognition for each program and each applicable program/degree level) from the Educational Leadership Constituents Council (ELCC) prior to submission of the GaPSC Intent to Seek Approval Form. Letters from ELCC indicating formal recognition must be attached to the form.
- (3) All programs must maintain regional and national accreditation, as well as National Recognition of programs in order to maintain GaPSC approval and, thus, the ability to offer programs leading to Georgia certification.
- (4) As presented in GaPSC Rule 505-3-.58, *Educational Leadership Program*, programs leading to certification in the field of Educational Leadership are required to engage each candidate in an extensive and intensive performance-based program. Key characteristics of such programs are:
 - i. “performance-based experiences in courses as well as during an extended residency, that account for one-half or more of the program’s requirements and that provide significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in the program standards through substantial, sustained, standards based work in actual school and school system settings or similar settings for candidates employed in agencies or organizations not classified as schools or school systems”. Rule 505-3-.58, paragraph (2) (b) 3. (ii).
 - ii. Importantly, such programs are to be “planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district, agency, or organization personnel and with assessment the responsibility of the institutions.” It must be clear that the program provider and the entity in which candidates complete the residency share mutual and ongoing responsibility for ensuring that the program provides the guidance, structure, and rigor that are expected. Rule 505-3-.58 can be accessed at: <http://www.gapsc.com/Rules/Current/EducatorPreparation/505-3-.58.pdf>.
 - iii. Out-of-state program providers are encouraged to carefully design and maintain programs that are offered at the” building or school system-level, based on the specific job assignment of the educator” as well as all other requirements of Rule 505-2-.300 (www.gapsc.com/Rules/Current/Certification/505-2-.300.pdf).

- (5) The Georgia Professional Standards Commission has produced several additional documents and resources of which out-of-state providers, in particular, should be aware. In addition to those noted above, providers are encouraged to refer to www.gapsc.com/Policies_guidelines/pg_leadershipProgram.asp for program-specific guidance.
- (6) All programs, including those offered by out-of-state providers, must conform to GaPSC requirements for reporting program and candidate data. These include at least:
 - i. Preparation Approval Annual Report (PAAR)
 - ii. Title II data collection and verification schedule
 - iii. Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA) annual reporting

B. Ethics

5. Georgia Code of Ethics for Educators (teaching and assessing in programs)

Rule Statements and References

Georgia PSC-approved education program providers shall ensure that candidates complete a well-planned sequence of courses and/or experiences in professional studies that includes knowledge about and application of professional ethics and social behavior appropriate for school and community, as well as specific knowledge about the Georgia Code of Ethics for Educators. Candidates are expected to demonstrate knowledge and dispositions reflective of the standards and requirements delineated in the Georgia Code of Ethics for Educators. GaPSC-approved education program providers shall assess candidates' knowledge of professional ethical standards and the Georgia Code of Ethics for Educators either separately or in conjunction with assessments of dispositions. Rule 505-3-.01, paragraph (3) (e) 7.

In addition to course content related to the Georgia Code of Ethics for Educators, GaPSC-approved education program providers shall provide information to each candidate on professional ethical standards, the Georgia Code of Ethics for Educators, the process for completing a background check, and application procedures for certification and employment. Rule 505-3-.01, paragraph (3) (e) 14.

Implementation

- (1) Timeline:
Full implementation is expected for all programs by fall 2013.
- (2) Definition:
Full implementation means all educator preparation programs include knowledge about and application of professional ethics and social behavior and specific knowledge about the Georgia Code of Ethics for Educators. It also means that an assessment of candidates' knowledge of the Georgia Code of Ethics for Educators has been developed and is in place. The assessment can be embedded in a dispositions assessment or it can be a separate assessment.

(3) Suggested Phases of Implementation:

Spring 2013:

- i. Review curriculum and syllabi. Revise curriculum as necessary to ensure explicit instruction about professional ethics and the Georgia Code of Ethics.
- ii. Review current dispositions assessment(s). Determine if EPP/programs will revise the dispositions assessment to include an assessment of knowledge of the Code of Ethics or if a separate assessment will be developed for that purpose. Revise current or develop new assessment.

Fall 2013: Implement curricular changes and the revised or new assessment.

Spring 2014: By spring 2014, the EPP should have data to support the assessment of candidates' knowledge of the Georgia Code of Ethics for Educators.

Guidance

Amendments to Rule 505-3-.01 related to educator ethics are aimed at placing more of an emphasis on ethics during the preparation of educators. Too often we find that candidates receive information about the Georgia Code of Ethics for Educators and/or the professional ethical behaviors expected of educators in brief sessions offered only one or two times over the course of a preparation program. The rule statements referenced above indicate that the teaching of ethics should be embedded throughout all relevant coursework or requirements of a preparation program. In addition, the rule makes clear that candidates' knowledge of educator ethics should be assessed in regular and meaningful ways, either in conjunction with assessments of dispositions or separately. The intention is for a great deal more emphasis to be placed on educator ethics, and the Georgia Code of Ethics for Educators, throughout preparation programs.

As noted above in the suggested phases of implementation, curricula and assessments will likely need to be revised to meet the expectations specified in the rule. The following suggestions are provided to help guide program providers as revisions are considered.

- (1) Require candidates to sign and date, upon acceptance into teacher preparation programs, an affirmation that they have read, understood, and will abide by the Georgia Code of Ethics for Educators.
- (2) The Georgia Code of Ethics for Educators and the general body of knowledge on educator ethics should be embedded in conceptual frameworks and throughout program coursework. Candidates' knowledge of educator ethics and the Georgia Code of Ethics for Educators should be consistently evaluated throughout courses and particularly during field and clinical experiences.
- (3) At admission, candidates should receive and sign the appropriate programs of study for their certification fields, to include the planned methods for meeting all GaPSC requirements for certification.

- (4) Prior to program completion, candidates should demonstrate knowledge of employment processes, including the completion of criminal background checks and application for certification.

Prior to admission to a GaTAPP program, candidates should receive information regarding the application process and the importance of “true and correct” information submitted by the candidate as well as information regarding the criminal background check. Candidates are not officially admitted into the program until all admission requirements are complete.

Candidates in endorsement programs, typically practicing teachers, should be assessed upon their knowledge of the Georgia Code of Ethics for Educators and general educator ethics if there is a connection to the content/purpose of the program, or if they were initially prepared out-of-state.

C. Clinical Practice, Field Experiences, and Partnerships

6. Clinical Practice Requirements

Rule Statements and References

GaPSC-approved education program providers shall offer clinical practice (student teaching/internships) in those fields for which the EPP has been approved by the GaPSC. Candidates must spend a minimum of one full semester or the equivalent in student teaching or internships in regionally accredited schools. GaPSC preparation program rules may require additional clinical practice (reference Rules 505-3-.05-.61). Rule 505-3-.01, paragraph (3) (e) 4.

Implementation

(1) Timeline:

Full implementation is expected by fall 2014 for all initial educator preparation programs (traditional, non-traditional, and endorsements).

(2) Definition:

Full implementation means:

The EPP can provide evidence that candidates spend a minimum of one semester in clinical practice.

(3) Suggested Phases of Implementation:

Spring 2013: Program providers should review current Student Teaching/Internship requirements and determine if revisions are needed.

Academic Year (AY) 2013-14: If revisions are needed, collaborate with B-12 partners to adjust expectations and plans. Revise all procedural and policy documents such as handbooks, brochures, catalogs, etc.

Fall 2014: The EPP is expected to provide evidence that candidates spend a minimum of one semester in clinical practice.

Guidance

Rule 505-3-.01 requires program providers to “offer clinical practice (student teaching/internships) in those fields for which the EPP has been approved by the GaPSC. Candidates must spend a minimum of one full semester or the equivalent in student teaching or internships in regionally accredited schools.”

(1) What is Clinical Practice and how is it distinguished from Field Experiences?

Clinical Practice is defined as “Student teaching or internships that provide candidates with an intensive and extensive culminating activity.” Field Experiences are defined as “those activities that include organized and sequenced engagement of candidates in settings that provide opportunities to observe, practice, and demonstrate the

knowledge, skills, and dispositions delineated in institutional, state, and national standards.”

- (2) How long should the clinical practice last?
NCATE’s Blue Ribbon report on Clinical Practice provides a framework for these experiences. Program providers are encouraged to implement a year-long internship and are required to provide a minimum of one semester. Program providers should consult other Rules documents and program standards to check specific program requirements in regard to length of the internship. Quality rather than quantity of experiences is most important. Innovation is encouraged; program providers should consider implementing emerging best practices such as the co-teaching model and/or other methods to improve the clinical practice experience for pre-service teachers, as well as the practicing teachers and students in the clinical setting.

7. Definition of and Expectations for Field Experiences

Rule Statement and Reference

GaPSC-approved education program providers shall require in all programs leading to initial certification and endorsement programs, field experiences that include organized and sequenced engagement of candidates in settings that provide them with opportunities to observe, practice, and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions delineated in institutional, state, and national standards. The experiences must be systematically designed and sequenced to increase the complexity and levels of engagement with which candidates apply, reflect upon, and expand their knowledge and skills. Since observation is a less rigorous method of learning, emphasis should be on field experience sequences that require active professional practice or demonstration and that include substantive work with P-12 students or P-12 personnel as appropriate depending upon the preparation program. In traditional teacher preparation programs field experiences occur prior to clinical practice (student teaching or internship); in non-traditional programs, such as the Georgia Teacher Academy for Preparation and Pedagogy (GaTAPP) program or post-baccalaureate programs in which candidates are employed as full-time teachers, field experiences may occur simultaneously with clinical practice. In endorsement programs, field experiences are typically job-embedded, occurring in the candidate’s classroom or employment setting. Rule 505-3-.01, paragraph (3) (e) 9.

Implementation

- (1) Timeline:
Full implementation is expected by fall 2013 for all initial educator preparation programs (traditional, non-traditional, and endorsements).

(2) Definition:

Full implementation means:

All programs reflect the new definition of field experiences. The EPP must ensure that all field experiences include organized and sequenced engagement of candidates in settings that provide them with opportunities to observe, practice, and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions delineated in institutional, state, and national standards. The experiences must be systematically designed and sequenced to increase the complexity and levels of engagement with which candidates apply, reflect upon, and expand their knowledge and skills.

(3) Suggested Phases of Implementation:

Spring and summer 2013: The EPP should engage all appropriate stakeholders (e.g. field directors/coordinators, faculty, representatives of partner schools, etc.) in examining and revising field experiences. All aspects of the experiences should be reviewed and revised as needed; the structure, sequencing/design, levels of engagement with students, requirements for reflection and feedback, placement sites, etc. should be analyzed against the new definition. Of particular focus should be questions such as:

- i. Are observation experiences structured in ways to make them most meaningful?
- ii. At what point in the program and how frequently do candidates have opportunities to practice, and demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and dispositions.
- iii. Do the experiences increase in complexity and levels of engagement?
- iv. To what degree are candidates required to apply, reflect upon, and expand their knowledge and skills in all field experiences?

The work to examine and revise field experiences should be documented and all changes should be reflected in syllabi, tracking systems, assessments, etc.

Fall 2013: By fall 2013, field experiences in all programs should begin to reflect the new definition. Emphasis should be on field experience sequences that require active professional practice and/or demonstration that include substantive work with P-12 students or P-12 personnel as appropriate depending upon the preparation program.

By spring 2014 evidence should be available indicating field experiences meet the new definition.

Guidance

The revised rule requires that field experiences be “systematically designed and sequenced to increase the complexity and levels of engagement with which the candidates apply, reflect upon, and expand their knowledge and skills.”

(1) What are Field Experiences and how are they distinguished from Clinical Practice?

Field Experiences are defined as “those activities that include organized and sequenced

engagement of candidates in settings that provide opportunities to observe, practice, and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions delineated in institutional, state, and national standards.” These experiences are distinguished from Clinical Practice, which is defined as “Student teaching or internships that provide candidates with an intensive and extensive culminating activity.” For institutions of higher education, field experiences take place outside of the university classroom.

(2) When should Field Experiences occur?

Field Experiences should begin early and should be integrated throughout each candidate’s preparation program.

The revised rule further states that “in traditional teacher preparation programs field experiences occur prior to clinical practice (student teaching or internship); in non-traditional programs, such as the Georgia Teacher Academy for Preparation and Pedagogy (GaTAPP) program or post-baccalaureate programs in which candidates are employed as full-time teachers, field experiences may occur simultaneously with clinical practice. In endorsement programs, field experiences are typically job-embedded, occurring in the candidate’s classroom or employment setting.” Due to these distinctions, it is important to note that field experiences and clinical practice may happen simultaneously in GaTAPP and post-baccalaureate programs.

(3) What does “systematically designed and sequenced” mean?

Preparation programs should ensure that candidates are involved in field experiences as early as possible, even before program admission. Field experiences should begin with less-involving tasks and student interactions and grow to more-involving, hands-on activities over time. A candidate’s field experiences may begin with simple tasks such as roll call or one-on-one tutoring and grow to mini lessons and whole class teaching. Program providers should design a sequence of experiences for each program that will ensure increasing involvement of candidates during the course of the program.

Non-Traditional EPPs should ensure that candidates have field experiences that provide opportunities to gain KSD in the appropriate grade levels for which they are seeking certification. Field Experiences must be purposeful, meaningful, and useful in the preparation of candidates. EPPs should also ensure candidates experience classrooms that are culturally and demographically different from their own classroom. After the experience, the candidates must have opportunities to implement lessons designed on identified differences documented in their observations. These implementations could take place with actual students when possible or in simulated lessons during seminars or equivalent with coaching by the instructor and/or peers.

(4) What is meant by “active professional practice or demonstration”?

Field experiences should involve candidates in active roles in B-12 schools. These practices should reflect hands-on participation rather than passive observation throughout much of the experience. Candidates should begin developing the

knowledge, skills, and dispositions of a professional educator at program entry and continue this development throughout the program.

- (5) What is “substantive work”?
Field experiences should also provide candidates with the opportunity to develop lessons and strategies that demonstrate impact on B-12 student learning. Candidates should incorporate their content and pedagogical knowledge in preparing activities to ensure effects on student learning.
- (6) What should candidates actually do during their field experiences?
Candidates should take on an active role in effecting student learning during their field experiences. This role might include tutoring students in small groups or teaching a mini lesson to the full class. Other professional educators might take on some administrative tasks through guidance from B-12 mentors. Candidates should reflect on these multiple experiences in their developing role as professional educators.
- (7) What kind of field placements should candidates experience?
Candidates should experience a wide range of field experience placements in diverse settings. This would include experiences in multiple grade and socio-economic levels as well as experiences with a variety of races and ethnicities. Candidates should also work with special education students. Field experience placements should progress in difficulty with more professional responsibilities given to candidates over time.
- (8) How should these placements be tracked?
Providers should develop a tracking system that will allow them to ensure quality and diversity of placements. Program providers must track grade levels, socio economic and ethnic backgrounds as well as experiences in ESL and special education classrooms.

8. Field Experience requirements for Birth Through Kindergarten programs

Rule Statement and Reference

GaPSC-approved education program providers shall ensure that candidates complete supervised field experiences consistent with the grade levels of certification sought. For Birth Through Kindergarten programs field experiences are required at three age levels: ages 0 to 2, ages 3 to 4, and kindergarten. For early childhood education programs (P-5) field experiences are required in three grade levels: PK-K, 1-3, and 4-5. For middle grades education programs field experiences are required in two grade levels: 4-5 and 6-8. Programs leading to P-12 certification shall require field experiences in four grade levels: PK-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12; and secondary education programs (6-12) shall require field experiences in two grade levels: 6-8 and 9-12. Rule 505-3-.01, paragraph (3) (e) 10.

Implementation

(1) Timeline:

Full implementation is expected immediately for all initial teacher preparation programs (traditional, non-traditional, and endorsements).

(2) Definition:

Full implementation means:

All Birth Through Kindergarten programs must require field experience with children at three age levels: ages 0 to 2, ages 3 to 4, and kindergarten. The EPP must develop a systematic documentation system to track placements for all candidates.

Guidance

GaPSC-approved education program providers shall ensure that candidates complete supervised field experiences consistent with the grade levels of certification sought. For Birth through Kindergarten programs field experiences are required at three age levels: ages 0 to 2, ages 3 to 4, and kindergarten. Examples of placement sites include: accredited day care centers, Head Start centers, child care centers on technical college and university campuses, DECAL Centers of Distinction, Montessori classrooms, Pre-K classrooms in public and private schools, faith based child care centers, after school programs, Sheltering Arms centers, licensed group homes, and licensed family childcare centers.

9. Partnerships (new definition)

Rule Statement and Reference

GaPSC-approved education program providers shall establish and maintain collaborative relationships with P-12 schools which are formalized as partnerships and focused on continuous school improvement and student achievement through the preparation of candidates and professional development of P-20 educators. Rule 505-3-.01, paragraph (3) (e) 3.

Implementation

(1) Timeline:

Full implementation is expected by fall 2015 for all preparation programs (traditional, non-traditional, and endorsements).

(2) Definitions:

Full implementation means:

By the beginning of 2015-16 academic year, program providers are working collaboratively with P-12 (or B-12 if applicable) partners on initiatives focused not only on the preparation of educators, but also on the continuous improvement of student achievement and professional development of educators. These partnerships should be reciprocal in nature, such that the school benefits from having candidates and program provider faculty participate in the school environment, and program provider faculty benefit by remaining current in their knowledge of B/P-12 practice, by having opportunities to conduct action research, etc. Partnerships should be formalized, in that they are clearly documented in evidence such as Memoranda of Understanding detailing the purposes of the partnership and the roles of all stakeholders.

(3) Suggested Phases of Implementation:

AY 2013-14: Program providers should begin work to improve partnerships. This work should involve examining current partnerships and identifying with B/P-12 partners the changes needed to make them more reciprocal. Specific actions might include:

- i. Creating a plan for revising partnership agreements. Initial efforts could begin with an analysis of the relationship with school partners, how demographics and/or other issues create barriers to the desired relationship, and how the barriers could be addressed (worked-around, eliminated, or approached differently).
- ii. Sharing the plan with stakeholders and seeking their feedback through face-to-face or virtual meetings.

AY 2014-15: Work to improve partnerships should continue and new initiatives or changes should be implemented to the extent feasible. The EPP must document the changes and the involvement of the professional community in revising partnership agreements and implementing changes.

AY 2015-16: Evidence should be available to support the full implementation of partnerships meeting the new definition.

Guidance

The new definition of partnerships is intended to improve the preparation of educators and, ultimately, student achievement. It is designed to push program providers to think more broadly about the roles of school partners--the cooperating teachers, school administrators, and others—in preparing educators, and to more deeply engage with them in the teaching and learning process for the entire school.

- (1) Key words and phrases such as *collaborative, formalized, continuous school improvement, student achievement, and professional development of P-20 educators*, are worthy of more explanation.
 - i. *Collaborative* partnerships are those in which the needs of all parties are addressed. B/P-12 partners should be fully engaged in designing the partnership. As referenced in the implementation section above, it will be critical for program providers to examine current partnerships and determine if they are meeting the needs of the schools. School partners should be invited to participate in a discussion on how pre-service teachers/interns and program provider faculty can help improve teacher performance and increase student achievement. For instance, conversations with school/district partners might center around questions such as:
 - *Are our completers well-prepared? Do they possess the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to be effective in your schools/district?*
 - *What types of professional development might our faculty provide to help boost teacher performance and student achievement in your schools?*
 - *How can/should we change field experience and clinical practice models to best meet the needs of your current teachers and students as well as your future workforce?*
 - ii. *Formalized* partnerships are intentional and the expectations for all stakeholders are documented. After agreements are reached as to how partnerships will change, program providers should document the process and decisions. It is the responsibility of the EPP to ensure that partnership agreement documents such as Memoranda of Agreement/Understanding are updated to reflect the new definition of partnerships and to describe any new or expanded components of the relationships.
 - iii. The use of terms *continuous school improvement, student achievement, and professional development of P-20 educators*, implies that partnerships should be focused not only on the preparation of educators, but also on meeting the learning needs of the school. For instance, if the school improvement plan indicates an area for improvement related to student achievement in reading,

candidates participating in field experiences/clinical practice should be prepared to implement current best practices related to the teaching of reading, EPP faculty should be prepared to provide related professional development to practicing teachers, and the partner school should welcome candidates and EPP faculty involvement in reading improvement strategies.

- (2) Non-Traditional program providers are also expected to meet the new definition of partnerships.
 - i. Local Education Agency (LEA) EPPs are encouraged to foster partnerships with the school leaders where candidates are placed as well as with other divisions/departments in the district.
 - ii. Regional Educational Service Area (RESA) EPPs should continue to build and improve relationships with district members and their schools.
 - iii. Organizations are encouraged to include as their partners all school districts, B-12 schools with EPP placements, RESAs, and IHEs in their service area.
 - iv. Associations should continue to build and improve relationships with member schools and/or school districts.
- (3) Program providers should avoid establishing exclusive agreements with school partners. Collaboration among program providers in service areas is encouraged. Each provider offers a unique set of skills and areas of expertise, all of which can benefit B-12 students.
- (4) Title IIA Equity plans require LEAs to participate in partnerships with EPPs in their service areas. Program providers are encouraged to learn about Equity Plans and the needs of their partner schools related to the equitable distribution of effective teachers as they explore ways to improve partnerships. GaPSC Education Specialists can assist program providers in approaching this work.

While partnerships are expected to improve in levels of engagement, it is not expected that each partnership with every school will rise to the level of a professional development school (PDS). Levels of partnership and clinical practice placements should be intentionally made such that all candidates have high quality experiences and the schools perceive value in candidates' placements. A link to the NCATE Standards for Professional Development Schools is provided in Appendix E.

D. National Standards

10. Conversion to InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards (replacing the GA Framework for Teaching)

Rule Statement and Reference

Preparation programs for educators prepared as teachers shall incorporate the latest version of the *InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards* developed by the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. Rule 505-3-.01, paragraph (3) (e) 2.

Implementation

- (1) Timeline:
Full implementation is expected by fall semester 2015 for all initial and advanced teacher preparation programs (traditional, non-traditional, and endorsements).
- (2) Definition:
Full implementation means all relevant aspects of teacher preparation programs—the conceptual framework, curriculum, assessments, field experiences, and student teaching—incorporate the InTASC standards. It also implies evidence of candidate performance resulting from the administration of key assessments (e.g. practicum/internship assessments, portfolios, etc.) can be aligned with InTASC standards in order to demonstrate candidates meet the standards.
- (3) Suggested Phases of Implementation:
 - i. Academic Year (AY) 2013-14: Revise conceptual framework, curriculum, syllabi, assessment instruments, etc. Document the process and the involvement of the professional community.
 - ii. AY 2014-15: Implement revised programs and assessments and begin to collect key assessment data.
 - iii. AY 2015-16: Evidence of candidate performance related to the InTASC Standards will be available.

Guidance

- (1) Preparation programs for educators prepared as teachers shall incorporate the *Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Model Core Teaching Standards* developed by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). The InTASC standards should replace the Georgia Framework for Teaching as the basis upon which programs leading to teacher certification are developed. The ten standards are delineated into four general categories: (1) The Learner and Learning, (2) Content, (3) Instructional Practice and (4) Professional Responsibility which should provide the framework for all Georgia teacher preparation programs.
- (2) The InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards, based on a body of research about teacher practice and its impact on student achievement, provide a framework for pedagogy that

addresses the diverse needs of learners, the application of academic and global knowledge and skills, the alignment between assessment and instruction, the need for collaboration amongst educators, and the inclusion of leadership skills for all educators (including teachers). A complete literature review of the research base for the standards can be obtained at the InTASC website at [CCSSO - The Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium \(InTASC\)](http://www.ccsso.org/Resources/Programs/Interstate_Teacher_Assessment_Consortium_(InTASC).html) ([http://www.ccsso.org/Resources/Programs/Interstate_Teacher_Assessment_Consortium_\(InTASC\).html](http://www.ccsso.org/Resources/Programs/Interstate_Teacher_Assessment_Consortium_(InTASC).html)).

- (3) Supporting documents highlighting the alignment between the InTASC standards and the Danielson Framework, TAPS, and the edTPA will be made available. In addition, program providers are encouraged to use the InTASC Model Teaching Progressions as a resource. The progressions describe teacher behaviors at multiple levels of performance and may be helpful in the redesign of the EPP's conceptual framework and assessment system. It is suggested that internal and external stakeholders provide guidance and input into the revision of the program's foundational components (i.e. conceptual framework, assessment system, curriculum, etc.).

11. Preparing Teacher Candidates to Teach any State-mandated Curriculum (CCGPS)

Rule Statement and Reference

GaPSC-approved education program providers shall ensure that candidates are prepared to implement the appropriate sections of any Georgia mandated curriculum (i.e., Georgia Performance Standards (GPS); Common Core Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS)) in each relevant content area and any Georgia mandated educator evaluation systems. Rule 505-3-.01, paragraph (3) (e) 6.

Implementation

- (1) Timeline:
Full implementation is expected immediately for all non-traditional program providers and endorsement providers. Traditional program providers should meet full implementation by fall 2013.
- (2) Definitions:
Full implementation means aspects of the teacher preparation programs that deal with curriculum, assessment, and instruction align with the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics or the Georgia Performance Standards in other subject areas.

Common Core Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS) refers to the set of curriculum standards available for English language arts and mathematics. *Georgia Performance Standards (GPS)* refers to curriculum standards currently in place for social studies,

science, and other subjects. GPS will be converted to CCGPS in coming years; providers should convert to CCGPS as they become available for additional content areas.

- (3) Suggested Phases of Implementation:
 - i. All Program Providers: Spring and summer of 2013: Revise curriculum to reflect the implementation of English/Language Arts and Mathematics CCGPS. Document the process and the involvement of the professional community.
 - ii. All Program Providers (Fall AY 2013): Implement revised curriculum and ensure availability of documentation of alignment and any applicable assessment data.
 - iii. Program providers will be expected to fully implement new standards within one academic year of the date they are officially adopted by the State.

Guidance:

- (1) All program providers are expected to incorporate the relevant state-mandated standards into program curricula. Georgia Performance Standards are expected to be fully implemented in program coursework and assessments. If the work has not yet begun, program providers offering programs in mathematics and English/language arts should immediately begin the process of incorporating the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards into curricula and key assessments.
- (2) CCGPS resources may be found on a number of websites, including the Georgia Department of Education webpage, [Common Core Georgia Performance Standards \(http://www.doe.k12.ga.us/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Curriculum-and-Instruction/Pages/CCGPS.aspx\)](http://www.doe.k12.ga.us/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Curriculum-and-Instruction/Pages/CCGPS.aspx). A number of other national websites, webinars, and resources are listed there, as well.
- (3) RESAs should be considered an important resource to help EPP faculty learn about the CCGPS and the growing body of knowledge around their implementation.

E. Recommending for Certification Five or More Years after Completion

Rule Statement and Reference

GaPSC-approved education program providers may recommend program completers for certification under the approved program in effect at the time the student was officially admitted to the program or the approved program in effect when the student successfully completes the program. Program completers must be recommended for certification within five years of completing an approved program. Completers seeking a recommendation for certification more than five years after completing a program will be denied or otherwise must meet requirements specified by the program provider to assure up-to-date knowledge in the field of certification sought. Rule 505-3-.01, paragraph (3) (g) 5.

Implementation

(1) Timeline:

Full implementation is expected immediately, as of the rule effective date of January 15, 2013, for all program providers.

(2) Definitions:

Full implementation means starting January 15, 2013, program completers should seek GaPSC certification within five years of completing a state-approved preparation program. If an individual who completed a program more than five years in the past asks a program provider to recommend her/him for certification, the program provider has the following options:

- Deny the request, or
- Assess the completer's experiences since program completion and based on that assessment, require additional coursework or experiences to ensure the individual's knowledge and skills are current (would meet the current standards and program requirements).

Guidance

Approved program providers may recommend to the GaPSC candidates who have successfully completed approved programs for certification in Georgia. In an effort to ensure that all newly certified candidates possess current knowledge and professional skills, updated Rule 505-3-.01 stipulates that "Program completers must be recommended [by their program provider] for certification within five years of completing an approved program." For program completers who request recommendation from their approved program provider more than five years after completing their program, individual providers are expected to apply appropriate supplemental activities, contemporary coursework, and/or assessments in which candidates demonstrate the currency of their professional competence.

Candidates who have met all requirements of the approved program, including demonstration of current professional competence, should be recommended electronically by the program provider via MyPSC and ExpressLane.

F. Technology

13. Preparing Teacher Candidates to Teach in a Digital Environment

14. Use of Technology in Field and Clinical Experiences

Rule Statements and References

GaPSC-approved education program providers shall require that candidates seeking certification demonstrate satisfactory proficiency in computer and other technology applications and skills and satisfactory proficiency in integrating technology into student learning. This requirement may be met through content embedded in courses and experiences throughout the preparation program and through demonstration of knowledge and skills during field and clinical experiences. At a minimum, candidates shall be exposed to the specialized knowledge and skills necessary for effective teaching in a distance learning environment. Rule 505-3-.01, paragraph (3) (e) 17.

Implementation and Guidance

(1) Timeline:

Full implementation is expected by fall semester 2014 for all initial educator preparation programs.

(2) Definitions:

Full implementation means the specific knowledge and skills candidates need to acquire to demonstrate proficiency in computer and other technology applications and proficiency in integrating technology into B-12 student learning have been identified and integrated into course content and program experiences. Opportunities for candidates to demonstrate effective application of current technological tools to support B-12 student learning during field and clinical experiences are established, and assessments are in place for programs to assess candidate proficiency. In addition, the necessary knowledge and skills to teach effectively in a distance learning environment are identified and reflected in course content and/or program experiences that provide candidates exposure or higher levels of attainment.

To accomplish these goals, program faculty members have received necessary training and are adept at effectively using current technological tools and consistently model appropriate uses to support candidates' and B-12 student learning.

(3) Suggested Phases of Implementation:

Academic Year (AY) 2013-14:

Technology Proficiency--Identify the expected knowledge and skills needed for candidate proficiency. Using current assessment data and feedback from the professional community, evaluate current program effectiveness in preparing candidates who are proficient in integrating technology to support instruction and student learning. Revise programs and assessments as needed to ensure a strategic and developmental process is in place for candidates to develop and demonstrate the expected knowledge and skills and for programs to assess candidate proficiency.

Distance Learning Teaching—Identify the necessary knowledge and skills and the expected level of candidate attainment (exposure or higher). Design course content and/or program experiences that will lead to the expected level of attainment. Program providers with an approved online teaching endorsement program may embed the endorsement in initial preparation programs once the rule is revised to allow for embedding.

Faculty Professional Development—Assess faculty needs related to using and modeling current technological tools to support candidate and B-12 student learning, including distance learning teaching. Provide professional development as needed.

1. AY 2014-15: Implement revised programs and assessments and begin collecting key assessment and other forms of data.
2. AY 2015-16: Evidence of candidate performance related to technology proficiency will be available.

G. Testing

15. Eligibility to Test for the Georgia Assessment for the Certification of Educators (GACE®)

Rule Statement and Reference

GaPSC-approved education program providers shall require a passing score on the appropriate state-approved certification assessment(s) required by the GaPSC before making a recommendation for Professional Certification. Education program providers shall determine traditional program candidates' readiness for state-approved content testing and shall authorize candidates for testing only in their field(s) of preparation and only at the appropriate point in the preparation program. Rule 505-3-.01, paragraph (3) (g) 4.

Implementation

(1) Timeline:

Full implementation is required at the point when the Georgia testing program provided by Educational Testing Service (ETS) begins, which is scheduled for October 2013.

(2) Definitions:

Full implementation means all individuals attempting to register for a GACE content assessment must be deemed eligible to test. Eligibility to test is defined for EPPs of traditional preparation as completion of content preparation that the EPP deems adequate enough to support a passing score on the appropriate state approved content assessment(s). Eligibility to test will be automatic for EPPs of non-traditional preparation.

Guidance

Once the GACE program transitions to Educational Testing Service (ETS), which is scheduled for October 2013, all examinees will be required to have an eligibility code, which indicates a readiness to attempt an appropriate GACE assessment. Some eligibility codes will be automatically assigned and some will require the GaPSC-approved education preparation program provider (EPP) to assert the examinee is ready to test.

All candidates either enrolled in or seeking admission to an educator preparation program will be required to set up an account/create a profile in MyPSC (available at <http://www.gapsc.com>). Candidates must register using their "legal name", which is found on the birth certificate, driver's license or other state-issued identification, or passport. Candidates are required to present a photo ID when seeking admission to a test center to take a GACE assessment. The ID presented at the test site must match the legal name, which is used to create the MyPSC account. As part of setting up an account in MyPSC, candidates or prospective candidates will be assigned a unique Georgia Certification ID. The GA Cert ID will be used when registering to test, when applying for certification, and for all future transactions with the GaPSC.

The process for establishing eligibility to test varies by program type. For all prospective test-takers (examinees), eligibility will be verified as a part of the online ETS registration process.

(1) Traditional Programs (degree programs leading to initial certification)

Eligibility to test is determined by the EPP's verification of those candidates who are eligible to register to attempt assessments in the field of preparation. To determine eligibility to test, EPPs should:

- i. monitor candidate preparation throughout established coursework or credit hours within a preparation program;
- ii. provide information on test preparation and practice tests;
- iii. make testing preparation and/or practice part of the admission to student teaching process; and/or
- iv. specify a class designed to examine candidate preparedness.

The EPP of traditional preparation will be able to grant eligibility for a single candidate or submit a file containing large numbers of candidates, all through www.gapsc.org. Files can be submitted at any point as needed by the EPP. The EPP will need to determine who will be responsible for indicating eligibility via www.gapsc.org.

When a traditional program candidate attempts to register for a test, s/he will be allowed to register to test only if the EPP has indicated s/he is eligible and only in the

field(s) of preparation indicated by the EPP. Once a candidate is approved to test in a field, s/he remains eligible; EPPs will not have to issue additional approvals for a candidate to re-take a failed test.

(2) Non-Traditional (GaTAPP) Programs

Because GaTAPP candidates are assessed to verify content knowledge upon program entry, GaTAPP EPPs will not be responsible for determining or validating in any way candidates' eligibility for testing. Individuals seeking admission to a GaTAPP program will be deemed eligible to test in all initial teaching fields for which there is a GACE content assessment. At the point of registration (in the ETS registration system) the prospective or current GaTAPP candidate will automatically be identified as eligible for testing after indicating s/he is seeking admission to or already enrolled in a GaTAPP program.

(3) Post-Baccalaureate, Certification-Only, or M.A.T. Programs

Similarly to non-traditional candidates, individuals enrolling in post-baccalaureate, certification-only, or M.A.T. programs are assessed to verify content knowledge at program entry; therefore, EPPs will not be responsible for determining or validating in any way eligibility for testing for individuals enrolled in these types of programs. Individuals seeking admission to or enrolled in one of these programs will be deemed eligible to test in all initial teaching fields for which there is a GACE content assessment. At the point of registration (in the ETS registration system) the prospective or current candidate will automatically be identified as eligible for testing after indicating s/he is seeking admission to or already enrolled in a M.A.T., post-baccalaureate, or certification- only program.

IV. Notifying the GaPSC of Substantive Changes Resulting from Rule Changes

Revisions to Rule 505-03-.01 will result in changes to program providers' current practices. As a result all approved program providers must submit a substantive change document to the GaPSC describing plans for complying with the revised rule. The plan should include how current practice will be modified to comply with the revised rule and a timeline for implementation.

Specifically the plan should detail:

- (1) what parts of the program will change, i.e. curriculum, assessments, field experiences;
- (2) how they will change, i.e. revised, replaced, removed; and
- (3) when they will change, i.e. fall 2013, spring 2014.

The document should be no more than five pages in length and should reference any changes by category, page and item number from the rule. For example a change to "a minimum amount of time candidates should spend in student teaching/internship" should be referenced *Partnerships, Field Experiences, and Clinical Practice page 4. (e) 2*. For ease of read, changes may be presented in the form of a matrix (a sample is provided in Appendix D).

All Substantive Change Documents related to the revision of Rule 505-03-.01 must be received in the GaPSC office no later than September 3, 2013.

Appendix A

Rule 505-3-.01 may be accessed at:

[GaPSC - Educator Preparation Rules](#)

(<http://www.gapsc.com/Rules/Current/EducatorPreparation/505-3-.01.pdf>)

The Georgia Code of Ethics for Educators may be accessed at:

[GaPSC - Code of ethics](#) (<http://www.gapsc.com/Ethics/CodeOfEthics.aspx>)

Appendix B

Quick Reference Guide – Summary of Implementation Dates

Following is a summary of the dates by which rule changes are expected to be fully implemented by EPPs. Refer to guidance and implementation plans in section III of this document for details.

	Effective Dates			
	Immediately January 15, 2013	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015
January 2013 Amendments to Rule 505-3-.01				
1. Approval Prior to Program Start	✓			
2. Approval Review Process Start Prior to Governing Board Approval	✓			
3. GaPSC Decision Options and Consequences for Rule/Policy Violations	✓			
4. Out-of-State Program Provider Requirements (for Ed. Leadership only)	✓			
5. Field Experience Requirements for Birth Through Kindergarten Programs	✓			
6. Non-traditional and Endorsement Programs: Preparing Teacher Candidates to Teach any State-mandated Curriculum (CCGPS)	✓			
7. Recommending for Certification Five or More Years After Completion	✓			
8. Readiness for State Content Assessment (GACE)		* ✓		
9. Georgia Code of Ethics for Educators (teaching and assessing in programs)		✓		
10. Definition of and Expectations for Field Experiences		✓		
11. Traditional programs: Preparing Teacher Candidates to Teach any State-mandated Curriculum (CCGPS)		✓		
12. Clinical Practice Requirements			✓	
13. Preparing Teacher Candidates to Teach in a Digital Environment			✓	
14. Use of Technology in Field and Clinical Experiences			✓	
15. B/P-12 Partnerships (new definition)				✓
16. Conversion to InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards (replacing the GA Framework for Teaching)				✓

*Implementation of readiness for testing procedures is required at the point when the Georgia testing program provided by Educational Testing Service (ETS) begins. ETS tests are scheduled for first administrations in October 2013; registration for those administrations may begin as early as spring 2013. Additional information about readiness for testing procedures will be shared with program providers as it becomes available and this document will be updated accordingly.

Appendix C

GaPSC Approval Decision Options

Adopted July 12, 2012

Effective September 1, 2012

Categories:

- I. **Approval Reviews**
- II. **Progress Reports**
- III. **Changes in National Accreditation Status and/or Failure to Meet Standards**
- IV. **Non-Compliance with Rules, Commission Decisions, or Procedures**

I. **Approval Reviews**

A. **Developmental Review Decision Options**

A Developmental Review is conducted for the purpose of verifying that a new professional education unit and/or proposed educator preparation programs have the capacity to meet the Georgia Standards (2008), and are ready to admit students and recommend them for certification.

1. **Developmental Approval** - Indicates the professional education unit and/or educator preparation program(s) meet the eight Georgia Standards (2008) and the professional education unit may begin offering the program and admitting candidates. Areas for improvement may be cited in the BOE Report, indicating concerns warranting the unit's attention. In its subsequent Preparation Approval Annual Report (PAAR) or in a Progress Report, the Commission may require the unit to describe progress made in addressing the area(s) for improvement cited. The next unit approval review, the Initial Performance Review, is scheduled within three years of the semester of the approval review.
2. **Provisional Approval** - Indicates the professional education unit and/or preparation program(s) have not met one or more of the Georgia Standards (2008). The unit/preparation program(s) has approved status and may admit candidates, but the unit must satisfy provisions by meeting the unmet standard(s) within a specified period of time. If Provisional Approval is granted, the Commission will require the actions described in either or both of the options described below, depending upon the severity of the unmet standard(s).
 - i. **Option 1:** submission of one or more Progress Reports addressing the unmet standard(s) and areas for improvement (if applicable) within a minimum of six months after the approval decision; and/or
 - ii. **Option 2:** a Focused Visit on the unmet standard(s) within two years of the semester the Provisional Approval decision was granted.

After one or more Progress Reports are submitted according to Option 1, the GaPSC will decide to either grant Developmental Approval or require a Focused Visit within one year of the semester in which the Progress Report was submitted. Focused Visit decision options are described in item D, below.

3. **Denial of Approval** - Indicates the professional education unit and/or educator preparation program(s) do not meet one or more of the Georgia Standards (2008) and have pervasive problems limiting capacity to offer quality professional education program(s) that adequately prepare candidates.

B. Initial Performance Review Decision Options

An Initial Performance Review is conducted for the purpose of determining whether performance data indicate the unit and programs are meeting standards and that candidates in the programs are meeting performance expectations delineated in standards. The Initial Performance Review typically occurs three years after a professional education unit and/or preparation programs are granted Developmental Approval.

After an Initial Performance Review, the GaPSC will apply the decision options listed below for Continuing Approval Reviews.

C. Continuing Review Decision Options

A Continuing Review is conducted periodically (typically every seven years) for the purpose of verifying that the professional education unit and educator preparation programs continue to meet the Georgia Standards (2008).

1. **Continuing Approval** - indicates the professional education unit and programs meet each of the eight Georgia Standards (2008). Areas for improvement may be cited, indicating problems warranting the unit's attention. In its subsequent Preparation Approval Annual Report (PAAR) or in a Progress Report, the Commission may require the unit to describe progress made in addressing the areas for improvement cited in the BOE Report. If Continuing Approval is granted, the next approval review will be scheduled for seven years following the semester of the previous Continuing Review.
2. **Continuing Approval with Conditions** - indicates the professional education unit and preparation program(s) have not met one or more of the eight Georgia Standards (2008). The professional education unit and program(s) maintain approval; however, the unit must provide evidence of meeting the unmet standard(s) within a specified period of time.

If Continuing Approval with Conditions is granted, the Commission will require the actions described in either or both Option 1 or Option 2.

- i. **Option 1:** submission of one or more Progress Reports addressing the unmet standard(s) and areas for improvement (if applicable) within a minimum of six months after the approval decision; and/or
- ii. **Option 2:** a Focused Visit on the unmet standard(s) within two years of the semester the Continuing Approval with Conditions decision was granted.

After one or more Progress Reports are submitted according to Option 1, the GaPSC will decide to either grant approval or require a Focused Visit within one year of the semester in which the Progress Report was submitted. After a Focused Visit occurs the GaPSC will decide to either grant Continuing Approval or revoke approval.

If Continuing Approval is granted, the next approval review will be scheduled for seven years following the semester in which the continuing approval review occurred. This scheduling maintains the unit's original approval review cycle.

3. **Continuing Approval with Probation** - indicates the professional education unit and/or preparation program(s) do not meet one or more of the standards, and have pervasive problems limiting capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates.

If Continuing Approval with Probation is granted, the unit must schedule an approval review within two years of the semester in which the probationary decision was rendered. This review process will mirror that of a Developmental Review. The unit, as part of this approval review, must address all of the Georgia Standards in effect at the time of the Probationary Review.

D. **Focused Review Decision Options**

A Focused Review is conducted for a professional education unit and/or educator preparation programs when one or more standards were unmet at the previous review; it may occur within two years after a Developmental Review, Initial Performance Review, or a Continuing Review resulting in a GaPSC decision of Provisional Approval, Approval with Conditions, or Approval with Probation. After a Focused Review, approval is either granted at the appropriate level or it is revoked.

1. **Approval**, either developmental or continuing depending upon the status of the unit when a focused visit decision was rendered, is granted if the previously unmet standards are found to be met during the Focused Review.

If **Developmental Approval** is granted, an Initial Performance Review will be scheduled for three years following the semester in which the Focused Review occurred.

If **Continuing Approval** is granted, the next approval review will be scheduled for seven years following the semester in which the previous Continuing Approval Review occurred. This scheduling maintains the unit's original approval review cycle.

2. **Provisional Approval or Approval with Probation** may be granted after a Focused Review if the previously unmet standards are found to be met with significant areas for improvement, or if one of multiple previously unmet standards is found to be unmet. If approval status prior to the Focused Review was developmental, Provisional Approval will be granted. If approval status prior to the Focused Review was continuing, Approval with Probation will be granted.

If **Provisional Approval** is granted, the Commission will prescribe provisions, or requirements, which must be met within a specified period of time.

Requirements may include an additional review or site visits by GaPSC staff, the submission of Progress Reports including evidence that areas for improvement have been addressed, or action plans addressing detailed steps the unit will take to address the unmet standard. If the areas for improvement or the unmet standard are satisfactorily addressed during the time allotted by the Commission,

an Initial Performance Review will be scheduled for three years following the semester in which the Focused Review occurred. If the Commission deems they are not fully addressed within the time allotted, approval will be revoked.

If **Approval with Probation** is granted, the Commission will prescribe provisions, or requirements, which must be met within a specified period of time. Requirements may include an additional review or site visits by GaPSC staff, the submission of Progress Reports including evidence that areas for improvement have been addressed, or action plans addressing detailed steps the unit will take to address the unmet standard. If the areas for improvement or the unmet standard are satisfactorily addressed during the time allotted by the Commission, the next approval review will be scheduled for seven years following the semester in which the previous Continuing Approval Review occurred. This scheduling maintains the unit's original approval review cycle. If the Commission deems the areas for improvement or unmet standard are not fully addressed within the time allotted, approval will be revoked.

3. **Approval may be revoked** if the previously unmet standards are found to be unmet during the Focused Review. After approval is revoked, candidates who were admitted to preparation program(s) prior to revocation of approval may complete the programs within a specified period of time and be recommended for certification; however, no new candidates may be admitted as of the date of the revocation.

E. Probationary Review Decision Options

A Probationary Review is conducted after a GaPSC decision of Approval with Probation has been granted for a professional education unit or preparation program(s), indicating that one or more standards are not met and pervasive problems limit the unit or program's capacity to meet standards. The Probationary Review process mirrors the Developmental Review process; all of the Georgia Standards (2008) are applied to the unit and/or programs on probation. Candidate performance data are not required. After a Probationary Review, approval is either granted at the appropriate level or it is revoked.

1. **Developmental Approval** is granted if all standards are found to be met during the Probationary Review. If approval is granted, the next approval review (Initial Performance Review) will be scheduled for three years after the semester of the Probationary Review.
2. **Approval is Revoked** if one or more standards are found to be unmet during the Probationary Review. After approval is revoked, candidates who were admitted to preparation program(s) prior to revocation of approval may complete them within a specified period of time and be recommended for certification; however, no new candidates may be admitted as of the date of the revocation.

II. Progress Report Decision Options

A. Progress is Satisfactory

If the Commission deems a Progress Report indicates satisfactory progress has been made in addressing areas for improvement, the decision options are:

1. **Progress is Satisfactory; Areas for Improvement are Removed.** This decision indicates evidence was presented confirming the areas for improvement have been corrected.
2. **Progress is Satisfactory, Areas for Improvement Remain.** This decision indicates plans were presented which may lead to correction of areas for improvement; however, evidence was not included to confirm they have been corrected. The Commission will ask for a subsequent Progress Report to include evidence that the areas for improvement have been corrected.

B. Progress is Unsatisfactory

If the Commission deems a Progress Report indicates satisfactory progress has not been made in addressing areas for improvement, the decision options are:

1. **Progress is Unsatisfactory; a Progress Report is Required.** This decision indicates evidence was not presented to indicate the areas for improvement are being addressed. The Commission will require one or more subsequent Progress Reports by specified dates.
2. **Progress is Unsatisfactory; a Focused Visit is Required.** This decision indicates neither plans nor evidence were presented to indicate the areas for improvement are being addressed. The Commission will require a Focused Visit on the Standards for which the areas for improvement were cited within two years.

III. Changes in National Accreditation Status and/or Failure to Meet Standards

A. National Accreditation Status

Georgia-based program providers must have an approved professional education unit in order to seek or maintain GaPSC approval to offer programs leading to Georgia educator certification. NCATE/CAEP accreditation of the professional education unit is accepted by the GaPSC in lieu of GaPSC professional education unit approval. The University System of Georgia requires NCATE accreditation of all institutions offering education programs and many of Georgia's private colleges elect to earn national accreditation.

For the purposes of GaPSC approval, professional education units accredited by NCATE or CAEP must maintain unit accreditation to maintain GaPSC program approval. If, for any reason, NCATE/CAEP revokes professional education unit accreditation, GaPSC program approval must also be revoked. Likewise, if professional education unit

approval is revoked by the GaPSC, program approval must also be revoked. Candidates enrolled in educator preparation programs prior to revocation of approval may complete the programs within a specified period of time and be recommended for certification; however, new candidates may not be admitted until unit and program approval is reinstated.

B. Failure to Meet Standards

All GaPSC-approved program providers must continue to meet standards between approval reviews. Through annual reports, the GaPSC collects candidate, program, and unit performance data from program providers. For example, to address the Standard 1 (*Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions*), requirement that 80% of a professional education unit's completers pass the state-approved content assessment, GACE content assessment pass rates are compiled annually for each program provider, reviewed by GaPSC staff, and reported to the U.S. Department of Education in the U.S. Title II Annual Report. Failure to maintain state content assessment pass rates at or above 80% will result in adverse unit approval actions by the GaPSC and, if lower than 80% pass rates persist for three consecutive years, revocation of approval by the GaPSC or revocation of accreditation by NCATE/CAEP.

The following approval actions will be applied when pass rates fall below 80% for one or more consecutive years:

1. One year – program providers with state content assessment pass rates below 80% for one year will be identified as At-risk of Low Performing. Program providers identified as At-risk of Low Performing are reported to the U.S. Department of Education and published in the U.S. Title II Annual Report. Upon identification as At-risk of Low Performing, GaPSC staff will initiate additional monitoring and technical assistance activities.
2. Two years - program providers with state content assessment pass rates below 80% for two consecutive years will be identified as Low Performing and professional education unit approval status will be changed to Approval with Probation (see approval definitions in section I above). GaPSC staff will continue to closely monitor and provide technical assistance. If unit pass rates meet or exceed 80% the next year, unit approval will be restored to the previous level and the unit's previous accreditation/approval cycle will be maintained.
3. Three years - program providers with state content assessment pass rates below 80% for three consecutive years will be identified as Low Performing and professional education unit and program approval will be revoked by the GaPSC. If the professional education unit is accredited by NCATE/CAEP, unit accreditation will be revoked and as a result, GaPSC approval must be revoked for all professional education programs offered by the unit. Candidates enrolled in educator preparation programs prior to revocation of approval may complete the programs within a specified period of time; however, new candidates may not be admitted until professional education unit and program approval is reinstated.

IV. Non-compliance

A. Rules

When GaPSC staff members become aware of a unit's confirmed, persistent and/or pervasive non-compliance with GaPSC rules, the Commission will be formally notified at the next appropriate meeting. Prior to bringing rules violations before the Commission, GaPSC staff will investigate the potential violation and gather pertinent documentation to determine if a violation is confirmed, and if the violation is persistent and/or indicative of pervasive violations of one or more rules.

For rules violations determined to be **non-persistent/non-pervasive**, staff will take the following actions:

1. Send a warning letter to include a description of the rule violation(s) and required corrective action steps; and/or
2. Require the submission of documentation, or a Progress Report describing and possibly including evidence of, the corrective actions taken.

Failure to meet staff requirements related to rules violations will result in escalation to the Commission and the actions described below.

For rules violations determined to be **persistent and/or pervasive**, Commissioners will decide to take one of the following actions, depending upon the severity of the violation(s):

1. Submission of documentation/Progress Report to the Commission
2. One or more Technical Visits by staff followed by a Report to the Commission
3. Submission of a report and a presentation to the Commission by the head of the professional education unit or his/her designee.

Failure to meet Commission requirements related to rules violations will result in a change of approval status to Approval with Probation for the professional education unit and all preparation programs. The actions following a probationary decision are described in Section I, above.

B. Commission Decisions

Failure to comply with Commission decision requirements will, depending upon the severity of the situation, result in either a warning letter or a change of approval status to Probation for the professional education unit and all educator preparation programs.

C. Violation of GaPSC Procedures

Failure to comply with GaPSC procedures will, depending upon the severity of the situation, result in one or more of the following actions.

1. Warning letter
2. Submission of documentation/Progress Report
3. Technical Visit

Unaddressed or repeated violations will be reported to the Educator Preparation Standing Committee for further action and may eventually result in loss of approval.

Appendix D

Revised Rule 505-03-.01 Substantive Change Template

Use this template to briefly describe substantive changes to programs resulting from changes to Rule 505-3-.01.
Remove the samples provided and add rows as needed.

Category, Page and Item # from the Rule	Exact Language from the Rule	Part(s) of the Program to be Changed	How will it be changed?	Timeline	Supporting Documentation (optional) Attached
e) Preparation Program Requirements, #4, page 5	“Candidates must spend a minimum of one full semester or the equivalent in student teaching”	Student Teaching Experiences	Student teaching placements will be revised and extended over a full academic year to equal or exceed one full semester	Spring 2014	Yes Title: Timeline for Phasing in Student Teaching Changes
e) Preparation Program Requirements, #3, page 6	“GaPSC-approved education program providers shall establish and maintain collaborative relationships with P-12 schools which are formalized as partnerships and focused on continuous school improvement and student achievement through the preparation of candidates and professional	P-12 Partnerships	Partnerships will be expanded.	Spring 2015	Yes Title: Timeline and Plan for expanding P-12 Partnerships

	development of P-20 educators.”				
--	---------------------------------	--	--	--	--

Appendix E

NCATE Standards for Professional Development Schools may be accessed at:

<http://www.ncate.org/PDS Standards>

(<http://www.ncate.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=FcHbf2B%2b670%3d&tabid=125>)

Appendix F

Summary of Version Updates

Version Publication Dates:

1. Version 1 published February 2013
2. Version 2 published April 2013

Version 2 Updates (include section and page numbers)

1. Introduction, contributing authors, page 5
2. Converting from the GA Framework for Teaching to the InTASC Standards Guidance paragraph (3), page 28
3. Substantive Change Report
Due date (page 36) and template examples (pages 47-48)